



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/086,370	02/28/2002	Michael E. Childs	702.124	2692
38933 7590 02/17/2010				
GARMIN LTD. C/O GARMIN INTERNATIONAL, INC. ATTN: Legal - IP 1200 EAST 151ST STREET OLATHE, KS 66062				
EXAMINER				
MANCHO, RONNIE M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3664				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/17/2010		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATENTS@GARMIN.COM



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address : COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10086370	2/28/2002	CHILDS ET AL.	702.124

GARMIN LTD.
C/O GARMIN INTERNATIONAL, INC.
ATTN: Legal - IP
1200 EAST 151ST STREET
OLATHE, KS 66062

EXAMINER

RONNIE MANCHO

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

3664

20100204

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The Reply brief dated 9/4/09 has been acknowledged.

In the reply applicant alleges that the examiner for the first time made a new 112 rejection on a third appeal after 7 years. Applicant's remarks are not persuasive. The 112 rejection is not new since it is referring to the same limitation in the claim. In the examiner's answer dated 8-6-09, the 112 rejection was written to incorporate the entire phrase of the same previously rejected claimed limitation. Therefore, the 112 rejection is not new.

However, applicant has not requested a first office action in view of the alleged new 112 rejection.

As such applicant's remarks are not convincing.

It is believed that all rejections in the answer are proper and should stand.

/Ronnie Mancho/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3664